DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

Before The FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

SEP 10 0

In the Matter of

Implementation of Sections of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992

Rate Regulation

MM Docket 92-266

No. of Copies rec'd_ List ABCDE

REPLY OF BELL ATLANTIC1

As other commenters have pointed out in response to the Further Notice in this proceeding, the Commission should not create an exemption to its substantive rate regulations for small systems that are affiliated with MSOs. This is so for two separate reasons.

First, exempting small systems affiliated with MSOs from the Commission's substantive rate regulations would directly contravene the underlying statute. The 1992 Act affirmatively requires the Commission to ensure that all cable subscribers pay reasonable rates -- not just subscribers served by large

The Bell Atlantic telephone companies ("Bell Atlantic") are The Bell Telephone Company of Pennsylvania, the four Chesapeake and Potomac telephone companies, The Diamond State Telephone Company, and New Jersey Bell Telephone Company.

Rate Regulation, MM Dkt No. 92-266, Mem. Op. and Order and FNPRM (rel. Aug. 10, 1993).

 $[\]frac{3}{\text{See}}$, $\frac{\text{e.g.}}{\text{e.g.}}$, Further Comments Regarding Small Systems By NATOA, et al. (Aug. 31, 1993).

systems.⁴ In fact, even the section of the Act that provides for procedural rules "to reduce the administrative burdens and cost of compliance" for small systems assumes that these systems will nonetheless be subject to the Commission's substantive regulations.⁵ Otherwise, there would be no burden or cost to reduce.

Second, exempting small systems affiliated with MSOs from the Commission's substantive regulations would be fundamentally at odds with the way the Commission regulates telephone companies. These latter regulations apply in small and large communities alike, and the Commission has never suggested it would exempt the part of a telephone company's operations that serve communities with 1,000 or fewer subscribers.

Moreover, to the extent the Commission modifies its procedural rules for small systems, it should recognize the additional resources and economies of scale that are available to

 $^{^4}$ E.g., 47 U.S.C. § 543(b) ("The Commission shall, by regulation, ensure that the rates for the basic service tier are reasonable").

⁵ 47 U.S.C. § 543(i).

Significantly, some of the MSOs that seek the benefit here of any rules adopted for small systems acknowledge that they serve over 750,000 subscribers. See Comments of the Falcon Group at 2 (Aug. 31, 1993). Although this is more than the number of access lines served by each of two of the Bell Atlantic telephone companies — those serving the states of West Virginia and Delaware — neither of these companies is exempt from the Commission's regulations in the small communities they serve.

small systems affiliated with MSOs. These systems can take advantage of centralized financial and administrative resources of the MSO to meet their regulatory obligations -- just as telephone companies do. This will reduce the cost and burden of complying with the Commission's rules compared with small systems that are independently owned, and must also be taken into account in framing any modifications to the procedural aspects of the Commission's rules.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward D. Young, III John Thorne Of Counsel Michael E. Glover 1710 H Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 392-1082

Attorney for the Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies

September 10, 1993

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing "Reply of Bell Atlantic" was served this 10th day of September, 1993, by first class mail, postage prepaid, to the parties on the attached list.

Jaynemarie Lentlie

Donna C. Gregg Michael Baker Wiley, Rein & Fielding 1776 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 Robert E. Levine
Mullin, Rhyne, Emmons & Topel
1000 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20036

Stephen J. Effros James H. Ewalt Robert J. Ungar Community Antenna Television Assoc. 3950 Chain Bridge Road P.O. Box 1005 Fairfax, VA 22030-1005 Arthur H. Harding Howard S. Shapiro Fleischman and Walsh 1400 Sixteenth Street, N.W. Sixth Floor Washington, D.C. 20036

Ward W. Wueste, Jr., HQE03J43 Marceil F. Morrell, HQE03J35 GTE Telephone Operations P.O. Box 152092 Irving, TX 75015-2092 James R. Hobson Jeffrey O. Moreno Donelan, Cleary, Wood & Maser 1275 K Street, N.W. Suite 850 Washington, D.C. 20005-4078

Stephen R. Ross
Paula E. Brodeur
Ross & Hardies
888 16th Street, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20006

Daniel L. Brenner Loretta P. Polk NCTA 1724 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Gardner F. Gillespie Jacqueline P. Cleary Hogan & Hartson 555 13th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004-1109 Allen C. Jacobson Tele-Media Corporation 2151 E. College Avenue State College, PA 16801

Shirley S. Fujimoto Joseph M. Sandre, Jr. Keller & Heckman 1001 G Street, N.W. Suite 500 West Washington, D.C. 20001

Eric E. Breisach Howard & Howard 107 W. Michigan Avenue Suite 400 Kalamazoo, MI 49007

Norman M. Sinel Patrick J. Grant Stephanie M. Phillips William E. Cook, Jr. Arnold & Porter 1200 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W. * BY HAND Washington, D.C. 20036

ITS, Inc. * 1919 M Street, N.W. Room 246 Washington, D.C. 20554